

EXHIBIT 10

From: Ralph Sassano [mailto:rsassano@us.ibm.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 27, 2013 12:29 PM
To: Jo Taylor
Cc: Adam Dooley; Daniel Mong; John McLaren; Tom Reilly; Steve Burgoyne; Mark.Goncalves@siriuscom.com
Subject: Re: UnCapped Shared Processors

Jo,

Yes all is OK and hope you are well. We are still waiting for spring here. It has been colder than normal.

I have asked several times who gave you the recommendation for uncapped and was never given a name. I would have not suggested it. I also discussed this with Mark the Sirius business partner technical person and asked if he had different view. We agree it is not something we would lead with.

The dilemma is a processor uses memory and IO. Assume we assign an LPAR 1 core, 16GB of memory and 24 disk arms. SAS disk is about 100 IO/s per arm so in this example we can likely handle 2400 IO request a second. At this point let also assume everything is running OK. Now the additional workload is submitted and the core is 100% busy and uncapped moves another core to the LPAR. Problem is the memory and disk allocation has not changed. The core demand for memory and IO overload the assigned resources and performance suffers.

I would not use uncapped unless I understood what the normal demand is and then at least double or triple the memory and IO resources for the LPAR. You may

be wondering if it ever makes sense to use it and in most cases for i5OS it does not (my opinion). If your workload is analytical or scientific it could have value.

These workloads

are not IO intensive so if it is just number crunching adding cores will improve performance.

Future releases of i5OS may change my view. For example the new memory model available on power7+ allows us to over allocate memory. So for example lets assume we normally need 16GB but we elect to have VIOS manage the memory so we could say we want 48GB. VIOS will then manage the memory storing

unused pages on high speed disk. I am not suggesting this for your workload but I do want to let you know what is possible. You should also know memory is

65K-8

inexpensive on Power7 when compared to what was sold on Power5 and Power6. If I was starting with a clean piece of paper I would size the system for what

is needed first. I would also elect to use external storage like the v7000 so I could use IBM HA and have the ability to do flashcopy for DR or backup. I would never need to take the LPAR down for backup. IBM HA requires the v7000 or DS8000. (The DS likely is too large for your workload.)

I realize the application is sunset so GSK is not willing to invest. If that changes I would be happy to your folks and Sirius and design a new platform. When we met with

Tom the Sirius folks had offered to review the systems. Has that work be done?

Regards,
Ralph Sassano
Power System Field Technical Support
Office 856-355-2307
Mobile 201-513-7822

Jo Taylor ---03/27/2013 09:40:56 AM---Hi Ralph Hope you are well. I'm just following up on conversation we had back in January and I'm n

From: Jo Taylor <jo.x.taylor@gsk.com>
To: Ralph Sassano/Cranford/IBM@IBMUS
Cc: John McLaren/Cranford/IBM@IBMUS, Adam Dooley/Piscataway/IBM@IBMUS, Tom Reilly <Tom.Reilly@gsk.com>, Daniel Mong <Dan.M.Mong@gsk.com>
Date: 03/27/2013 09:40 AM
Subject: UnCapped Shared Processors

Hi Ralph

Hope you are well. I'm just following up on conversation we had back in January and I'm not sure we ever got to a definitive answer.

The question is for the AS400 environment on whether or not Uncapped Shared Processing should be turned on. Based on what I know historically a decision was made, based on IBM guidance to switch this on. I know you previous had said that you have many clients that have turned this on without issue, but internally we are still having a hard time getting to a consensus on this in the

team and therefore I would like understand the definitive IBM views and thoughts on this as it relates to how the GSK AS400s are set up.

Thanks

Jo.

Jo Taylor

iSeries Service Delivery Manager

EXHIBIT 11

From: Jo Taylor

Sent: Monday, April 15, 2013 8:49 AM

To: Daniel Mong; Mike Bacon; Rick Oberholzer; Steve Farnden; Tom Reilly

Subject: Capped Vs Uncapped processors - Decision and Next Steps

Dear All

Thank you for your time and input to our Team Meeting discussion and subsequent session with IBM and Sirius on the subject of Capped vs Uncapped processors. After careful and further consideration, and in order to improve our capability to do Capacity & Performance planning & monitoring effectively, I have made the following decision that Uncapped Processing will be turned off across the fleet.

The rationale for this is as follows:-

1. Industry experts do not recommend it.
2. Standardisation of our fleet configurations
3. Maturity of our capability for Capacity & Performance modelling in this mode.
4. Unpredictability of demand and volume increases.

As agreed during our team workshop, Tom will be the Subject Matter Expert for Capacity. Working with Dan as SME on Performance monitoring and reporting, Tom will lead the effort to turn uncapped processing off. Tom will work with Dan and me to plan a phased approach to turning this off and work with me and the business to ensure that there is no business disruption as we go through this exercise. The priority will be the US Servers first.

I know that this issue has been very emotive over the last year and some of you will be unhappy with this decision, however a decision has to be made and a direction set in order to bring closure to this. We can ill afford to be distracted any further on this topic and have a number of priorities we need to achieve this year and so my hope is that now I have made this decision we can move on past this as one team.

I once again thank each and every one of you for your input on this subject.

Regards

Jo.

Jo Taylor

iSeries Service Delivery Manager

 **GlaxoSmithKline, 980 Great West Road, Brentford, TW8 9GS**

 Int: 8792 7110 | Ext: +44 207 076 7110 | Mob: +44 7825 116148

GSK-9

EXHIBIT 12

Tom Reilly

n: Jo Taylor
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2013 5:54 AM
To: Tom Reilly
Subject: RE: New LPAR Build

Tom

The build of KOPSA4P6 is part of an ongoing comm cell Action in BPCS to provide a host for the JDE Archive libraries that are currently sitting on KOPSA1P2 and contributing to the over running back up windows. The set up of the chameleon component whilst done by Rick as the Service Owner I missed adding your name to the component. I only realised this when the first change was raised and I was the only approver. I subsequently added you, so you should see all future changes.

Believe me when I tell you that I do understand your concerns about ensuring we have the right people doing the right work. However the reality is, is that we don't have that luxury. We only have 5 people in the team and more demand and work than we can probably sensibly do in a serial manner. Enabling every member of the team to work effectively and efficiently across all disciplines is paramount to our future success as a team and our capability to do work in a parallel manner.

Your role as Technical Lead is also critical here. I'm relying on you to put the documented procedures in place, the scripts and kits together ready for deployment and to train and do knowledge sharing with the other members of the team. This was your objective from last year to build an Engineering and Architecture capability. Having the documentation in place in enough detail so that the is minimal "wiggle" room for error must be a priority.

order for me to discuss with Rick your concerns on this latest build before we hand it over to the client please can you respond to these questions:

1. Where is the standard build kit located?
2. Where is it documented so that I can point Rick in the right direction to get the right media?
3. What other documentation does Rick need to complete this build?

Thanks

Jo.

Jo Taylor

GlaxoSmithKline, 980 Great West Road, Brentford, TW8 9GS
Int: 8792 7110| Ext: +44 207 076 7110 | Mob: +44 7825 116148

Fish Philosophy

From: Tom Reilly
Sent: 16 April 2013 19:46
To: Jo Taylor
Subject: RE: New LPAR Build

Hi Jo, I wasn't even aware until after the fact, and only found out by accident, that KOPSA4P6 was being built so didn't QA the change request because I wasn't an approver. I'm also not doubting the accuracy of the TIP I published or that part of the delivery process but have a number of other concerns. The tape media cut from KOPSX1P1 and used to build the KOPSA4P6 server is old so recent standard build changes and utility enhancements are most likely not incorporated in the build and the server would need immediate work to bring the objects up to date. On top of that, I am and have been of the opinion that Rick should not be delivering servers anymore, especially without assistance from others. He is not an engineering/delivery person, is not process oriented, doesn't understand the end to end process, and has a history of delivering servers which eventually have to be scrapped. He delivered a development server for Consumer NA (KOPSA2P3) which failed and had to be scrapped. He delivered the pre E1 legacy JDE SFS Development & Production servers (KOPSA3P4/KOPSA3P5) which failed and had to be scrapped. There was a significant investment of time and capital in that project which ended as a huge highly visible embarrassment to Brian (per Al Washco) and the entire service. He delivered the OneWorld reporting server (KOPSA3P1) which is in production but completely non standard and irreparable. He delivered the original E1 development server (KOPSA3P2) which failed and I had to personally scrap and rebuild under much duress because they were preparing to take the E1 service live. He delivered the KOPSA4P* servers, all of which had serious quality problems that I had to remediate. He delivered some of the MENA and Notes servers which had major quality problems that I had to remediate. He delivered the E1 V7R1 server (KOPSA3P6) which has extremely serious problems and needs to be scrapped because it's a huge risk to the service if being depended on for valid testing. I know I keep coming back to you with the same message but I'd told Brian for years, and backed it up with facts and data, that he's a hardware/operations person who doesn't have the skills to deliver servers. He continues to be given that responsibility and I'm at a loss to understand it. This is honest objective feedback and you could check with others if need be to verify the delivery failure of the Consumer development server, legacy JDE SFS development/production servers, etc. The service is at risk, new problems are being created, we're not learning from the past, he no longer has a crutch in Jud, and we're no longer staffed for me to remediate or rebuild servers. This is my opinion as the technical lead and I'm honestly not being difficult or disrespectful, only pointing out the risk that this situation presents to GSK and to you as the service owner. I believe the dated build is the first in a series of predictable mistakes he'll make during the delivery of this server which will eventually make it unusable. I'm just exasperated because it's happening under my nose, I've been through it before many times, I'm already tasked with remediating performance problems he created by enabling uncapped processors against my recommendation and security problems he created by disregarding my recommendations during the Boronia migration process. The process for delivering any new server (including development) and migrating data to that server should be no different for example than the process for delivering the production Boronia migration servers. You're aware of the many steps in the infrastructure and application critical paths and the various SOPs that need to be executed to deliver it correctly but this new server is being delivered in a vacuum and most of those steps are most likely not being taken into consideration. I understand the risk I'd be putting myself in if I made false statements or made these things up but I'm confident that I'm right and bringing it to your attention in the hope that we can stop making the same mistakes and start moving in the right direction. Tom

From: Jo Taylor
Sent: Monday, April 15, 2013 6:29 AM
To: Tom Reilly
Subject: New LPAR Build

Hi Tom

After our conversation on Friday I reviewed the change history for KOPSA4P6 and in particular CL875959 which is the server build Change Control. Rick has used an approved Technical Installation Plan, which was written by you.

Therefore I'm at a loss as to how this LPAR could have been built, in your opinion, using the wrong standard build.

Please can you advise further on this please. If the TIP_15393 should no longer be used then please arrange with Q&C to have it removed from the Q&C Web site immediately. The change is still in implementation phase and so if it needs to be backed out then please advise the correct documentation that should be used.

Thanks

Jo.

Jo Taylor

GlaxoSmithKline, 980 Great West Road, Brentford, TW8 9GS

Int: 8792 7110 | Ext: +44 207 076 7110 | Mob: +44 7825 116148

Fish Philosophy